

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-22 remain pending in the present application. Claims 17-22 are new. Basis for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Final Office Action mailed August 3, 2004, Claims 1, 2, 4, 8-11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito, et al. (U.S. 2001/0005686) in view of Reichelt (U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,072). Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito, et al. (U.S. 2001/0005686) in view of Nonogaki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,625,478). Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito, et al. (U.S. 2001/0005686) in view of Reichelt (U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,072) as applied to Claim 4 above, and further in view of Nonogaki (U.S. Pat. No. 6,625,478). Claims 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Naito, et al. (U.S. 2001/0005686) in view of Reichelt (U.S. Pat. No. 6,427,072) as applied to Claim 4 above, and further in view of Cathey, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,201,977). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Naito, et al. published on June 28, 2001 on an application which was filed in the U.S. on December 20, 2000 claiming priority of a Japanese patent application filed December 27, 1999.

The present application was filed in the U.S. on April 6, 2001 claiming priority from a Japanese patent application filed April 7, 2000. Enclosed is a certified copy of the priority application of the present action to remove Naito, et al. as a 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) reference. This certified copy was filed in response to the Final Office Action but

in the Advisory Action the Examiner refused to enter it. Applicant respectfully requests entrance of the certified copy of the priority application to remove the Naito, et al. reference. Since Naito, et al. uses 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as a means for becoming a 35 U.S.C. § 103 reference, the filing of this document also removes Naito, et al. as a valid 35 U.S.C. § 103 reference.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1-4 and 6-22 as pending, patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 9, 2005

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg